

Soap versus sanitiser for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections in the community: a systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis

Hoffmann, Tammy; Bakhit, Mina; Krzyzaniak, Natalia; Del Mar, Chris; Scott, Anna Mae; Glasziou, Paul

Published in:
BMJ Open

DOI:
[10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046175](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046175)

Licence:
CC BY-NC

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):

Hoffmann, T., Bakhit, M., Krzyzaniak, N., Del Mar, C., Scott, A. M., & Glasziou, P. (2021). Soap versus sanitiser for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections in the community: a systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis. *BMJ Open*, 11(8), [e046175]. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046175>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

BMJ Open Soap versus sanitiser for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections in the community: a systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis

Tammy Hoffmann , Mina Bakhit , Natalia Krzyzaniak , Chris Del Mar , Anna Mae Scott , Paul Glasziou 

To cite: Hoffmann T, Bakhit M, Krzyzaniak N, *et al.* Soap versus sanitiser for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections in the community: a systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e046175. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046175

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online. (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046175>).

Received 22 October 2020
Accepted 27 July 2021



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2021. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

Correspondence to

Professor Tammy Hoffmann;
thoffman@bond.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Objective To compare the effectiveness of hand hygiene using alcohol-based hand sanitiser to soap and water for preventing the transmission of acute respiratory infections (ARIs) and to assess the relationship between the dose of hand hygiene and the number of ARI, influenza-like illness (ILI) or influenza events.

Design Systematic review and meta-analysis.

Data sources Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), PubMed, Embase, Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) and trial registries were searched in April 2020.

Inclusion criteria We included randomised controlled trials that compared a community-based hand hygiene intervention (soap and water, or sanitiser) with a control, or trials that compared sanitiser with soap and water, and measured outcomes of ARI, ILI or laboratory-confirmed influenza or related consequences.

Data extraction and analysis Two review authors independently screened the titles and abstracts for inclusion and extracted data.

Results Eighteen trials were included. When meta-analysed, three trials of soap and water versus control found a non-significant increase in ARI events (risk ratio (RR) 1.23, 95% CI 0.78 to 1.93); six trials of sanitiser versus control found a significant reduction in ARI events (RR 0.80, 95% CI 0.71 to 0.89). When hand hygiene dose was plotted against ARI relative risk, no clear dose-response relationship was observable. Four trials were head-to-head comparisons of sanitiser and soap and water but too heterogeneous to pool: two found a significantly greater reduction in the sanitiser group compared with the soap group and two found no significant difference between the intervention arms.

Conclusions Adequately performed hand hygiene, with either soap or sanitiser, reduces the risk of ARI virus transmission; however, direct and indirect evidence suggest sanitiser might be more effective in practice.

INTRODUCTION

Acute respiratory infections (ARIs) cause a substantial annual health burden and much more so in the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Systematic review with meta-analysis and dose-response analysis of randomised controlled trials.
- Additional analysis of a subset of trials from a previously published systematic review and meta-analysis of physical interventions to reduce the spread of respiratory viruses.
- Conclusions are mostly from indirectness evidence, with direct evidence available from only four head-to-head trials.

Globally, approximately 4 million deaths per year are caused by ARIs, with the current pandemic leading to just over 4.3 million deaths.^{1 2} To minimise the potential threat of ARIs to public health, the implementation of effective preventive community-based measures is essential.^{3 4}

Hand hygiene has previously been shown to be an effective intervention that reduces the transmission of the viruses and bacteria that cause ARIs.^{5 6} It is a low-cost intervention that is applicable in all countries and all settings. Unlike vaccines that are disease specific, hand hygiene has the advantage of being applicable to multiple ARIs.⁵ Despite the effectiveness and worldwide applicability of hand hygiene, important questions for policy and practice remain, such as the dose-response and relative effectiveness of different materials (alcohol-based hand sanitiser; soap and water). This systematic review aimed to address these questions. This review is an additional analysis of a subset of randomised trials that were included in a large systematic review that addressed all physical interventions (eg, face masks, personal protection, hand hygiene and quarantining) to prevent the transmission of ARIs.⁵

METHODS

We aimed to find, appraise and synthesise studies of the effectiveness of hand hygiene interventions in the community for preventing ARI transmission. For this systematic review, a subset of articles relating to hand hygiene interventions were identified from a recently updated and published systematic review of all physical interventions for preventing ARI transmission. This review was not registered on PROSPERO as this review is an additional analysis of a subset of trials from a published Cochrane systematic review.⁵

Inclusion criteria and study source

Participants

We included studies of participants of any age, gender or condition. Trials in healthcare settings were excluded.

Interventions

We included studies of interventions that compared a hand hygiene intervention (ie, hand washing with soap and water or hand sanitiser) with a control intervention, or which compared two hand hygiene interventions.

Outcomes

We only included studies that reported a measure of ARI, such as influenza-like illness (ILI), influenza or respiratory infections, and this was our primary outcome. Studies were also eligible if they reported on ARI consequences (eg, days off work, complications, hospitalisation or death, if clearly reported as consequences of the respiratory illness), and these were our secondary outcomes.

Study design

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster randomised controlled trials (C-RCTs) were eligible.

Search strategy

RCTs and C-RCTs studying the effectiveness of hand hygiene interventions in the transmission of ARIs were identified from the parent 2020 systematic review.⁵ Studies for that review were identified via a search of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Embase and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), covering the dates October 2010 to 9 March 2020. The search string (see online supplemental file 1) was designed for PubMed using the word frequency analyser and then translated for use in other databases using the Polyglot Search Translator.⁷ A backwards and forward citation analysis, using Scopus, was conducted on all new studies retrieved. Search and citation analysis results were screened using the Robot-Search tool to remove all obvious non-RCTs.⁸ While the analysis of the parent review was being conducted, a new Cochrane review of rinse-free handwashing in school and preschool children was published, and we also screened its included studies for possible eligible studies.⁹ Three authors (TH, MB and NK) independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of identified studies to assess eligibility for inclusion. Discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

Screening and data extraction

Two review authors (MB and NK) independently screened the titles and abstracts for inclusion against the inclusion criteria. One author retrieved the full text and two authors screened the full-texts for inclusion. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion between the authors or with a third author. Data were independently extracted by two authors (MB and NK) on: volume or weight of material (eg, sanitiser or soap) used per person per day and number of hand-washes per person per day. When not reported directly, we estimated usage where possible (see table 1). For estimation purposes, we used data on the average amount of material used per person per handwash as reported; if data were not reported, we assumed 0.035 g of soap or 1.5mL of liquid used per handwash.¹⁰ A data extraction form for outcome data was piloted on two studies in the review. The following data were extracted from the parent systematic review⁵: (1) study characteristics; (2) risk of bias assessments; (3) type of handwashing intervention(s) (eg, soap, sanitiser and gel); and (4) RRs, log RR and SE values for ARI or ILI or influenza (including the outcome with most events from each study).

Risk of bias assessment

Risk of bias was assessed with the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool 1.¹¹ Author pairs from the parent review independently screened for: the method of random sequence generation and allocation concealment (selection bias), blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias), outcome reporting (attrition bias) and selective reporting (reporting bias). Disagreements were resolved by discussion or a third assessor. For each item, risk was either 'high', 'low' or 'unclear'.

Data analysis

To assess the relationship between handwashes per person per day and the number of ARI or ILI or influenza events, we conducted the following analyses: (1) only studies whose number of handwashes could be estimated (regardless of the type of handwash material), subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap) and (2) all studies (whether or not the number of handwashes could be estimated), subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap). We used a χ^2 test to test for subgroup interactions. Meta-analyses were conducted using *Review Manager* 5.4.

We used RRs for results, reporting the number of participants with an event. We undertook meta-analyses where data were sufficient to pool (when ≥ 2 studies or comparisons reported the same outcome). A random effects model was used because we expected some heterogeneity in the populations, interventions and outcomes of the included studies. The individual was used as the unit of analysis, where possible. However, where data on the number of individuals with primary and secondary outcomes of interest were not available, we extracted and used data for the closest equivalent ratio, for example, a rate ratio based on the ratio of total

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

First author (country, year)	Study design	Setting	Study period in months	Population (age range)	Number of participants	Type of hand hygiene intervention*			Duration of intervention	Number of handwashes/day	Type of infection	Calculations used for the number of handwashes/day (if applicable)	Amount of soap or alcohol used (mL or g)/ person/day	Calculations used for the amount of alcohol or soap in mL or g/person/day (if applicable)
						Staff training/ education	Classroom activities	Sanitiser Soap and soap						
Azor-Martinez ¹² (Spain, 2018)	C-RCT	CCCs	7	Ch (0–3 years)	911 Ch; 24 CCC	✓	✓	✓	8 months	7 (sanitiser)	ARI	Each child used sanitiser between 6 and 8 times/day	10.5 mL	Assume mean 7 uses per day, 1.5 mL mean per use
Biswas ¹⁶ (Bangladesh, 2019)	C-RCT	Sch	4	Ch (5–10 years)	10 855 Ch	✓	✓	✓	10 weeks	2.87	Influenza	We calculated the percentage of handwashing practices by dividing the number of handwashing instances by the total number of handwashing opportunities. There were 921 handwashing opportunities in the intervention group (page 5). 604 (66%) schoolchildren in the intervention group washed their hands (at end line) and 5077 students in the intervention group. 4.3 mL/person/day and assumed 1.5 mL of sanitiser use per wash gives 2.87 washes/day	4.3 mL	N/A
Correa ¹⁷ (Colombia, 2012)	C-RCT	CCC	8	Ch (0–5 years)	42 CCC	✓	✓	✓	8 months	5.261	ARI and GI	We assumed that one alcohol-based hand sanitiser push=1 instance of hand wash and took into account the proportion of community and preschools, as in the calculation for mL/person/day, gives 5.261 pushes (or handwashes) per day	3.16 mL	32 community centres and 10 preschools included the trial, distributed among the intervention and control arms; assumed the 32 versus 10 ratio to estimate the increase in the number of pushes: 10/42 * 4.5 for preschools+32/42*5.5 for community centres=5.261 average number of pushes overall. 5.261 pushes at 1000 mL/1666 pushes=3.16 mL
Cowling ¹⁹ (Hong Kong, 2008)	C-RCT	HH	7	A and Ch (NR)	198 HH	✓			9 days	NR	Influenza		NR	
Cowling ¹⁸ (Hong Kong, 2009)	C-RCT	HH	8	A and Ch (NR)	407 HH	✓			1 week	NR	Influenza		NR	
Hubner ²⁰ (Germany, 2010)	RCT	O	12	A (NR)	1230 A	✓		✓	1 year	3.84	ARI and GI	0.19 * 6 (assumed >5 handwashes means 6); 0.598 * 4 (average of 3–5); 0.205 * 1.5 (average of 1–2)+0.007 * 0 to get the mean number of handwashes per day across the whole group=3.84	11.52 mL	0.19 * 6 (assume >5 handwashes means 6); 0.598 * 4 (average of 3–5); 0.205 * 1.5 (average of 1–2)+0.007 * 0 to get the mean number of handwashes per day across the whole group=3.84 mean handwashes/person * 3 mL per handwash=11.52
Larson ²¹ (USA, 2010)	C-RCT	HH	20	A and Ch (NR)	509 HH	✓	✓	✓	19 months	1.77	ILI and influenza	44.2% in the education group (not handwash group) reported using hand sanitiser ‘occasionally at some point during the study’ and 56.9% of these reported using hand sanitiser 1–2x in previous 24 hours. 2.65 mL/person/day at 1.5 mL sanitiser per handwash=1.77 handwashes/day	2.65 mL	4.5 people/household; 30 days /month; 358 mL handwash per month gives; 2.65 mL/person/day

Continued

Table 1 Continued

First author (country, year)	Study design	Study period in months	Population (age range)	Number of participants	Type of hand hygiene intervention*				Duration of intervention	Number of handwashes/day	Type of infection	Calculations used for the number of handwashes/day (if applicable)	Amount of soap or alcohol used (mL or g)/ person/day	Calculations used for the amount of alcohol or soap used (mL or g)/ person/day (if applicable)
					Staff training/ education activities	Classroom	Sanitiser	Soap and soap						
Lennell ¹³ (Sweden, 2008) ^{†, ‡}	C-RCT	CCC	7	Ch (mean age 3 years)	1517 Ch; 29 CCC	✓	✓	✓	30 weeks	4 (sanitiser)	NC	N/A	6 mL	N/A
Little ²² (England, 2015)	RCT	Onl	26	A (≥18)	20066 A	✓		✓	4 months	7.48	ARI	$0.04 \times 1 \text{ avg} + 0.10 \times 3.5 \text{ avg} + 0.22 \times 5.5 \text{ avg} + 0.26 \times 8 \text{ avg} + 0.38 \times 10 \text{ avg}$ (assuming ≥ 10 at 10) = 7.48 avg	NR	
Nicholson ²³ (India, 2014)	C-RCT	HH	10	Ch (5–18 years)	NR	✓		✓	41 weeks	16	ARI and GI	The median soap consumption was found to be 45 g per household per week in control households compared with 235 g in intervention households. 5.6 g/person/day at 0.35 g of soap per wash = 16 handwashes a day	5.60 g	235 g/week; six people/household; gives: 5.595/person/day
Pickering ¹⁴ (Kenya, 2013)	C-RCT	Sch	§	Ch (2–13 years)	6 Sch	✓	✓	✓	8 weeks	NR	ARI and GI	NR	NR	
Ram ²⁴ (Bangladesh, 2015)	RCT	HH	18	A (NR)	NR	✓		✓	10 days	5.89	ILI and influenza	2.06 g soap/person/day at 0.35 g of soap per wash = 5.89 washes/day	2.06 g	Figure 3 in Ram et al ²⁴ reports median/capita soap use in grams by day of enrollment, days 2–12. Median/capita soap use in grams on last day (day 12) was 2.06 g
Roberts ²⁵ (Australia, 2000)	C-RCT	CCC	8	Ch (0–3 years)	23 CCC	✓	✓	✓	8 months	NR	ARI	NR	NR	
Sandora ²⁶ (USA, 2005)	C-RCT	HH	5	A (NR) and Ch (6 months to 5 years)	292 families		✓		5 months	5.2	ARI and GI	N/A	5.2 mL	Assumed 1 mL/hand sanitiser use (may not be correct as it is one pump but could have done >1 pump of sanitiser each handwash), 5.2 uses/day/person
Savolainen-Kopra ¹⁵ (Finland, 2012) ^{§, ‡}	C-RCT	O	18	A	683 A; 21 office work units; six corporations	✓	✓	✓	15–16 months	6.1 (soap) and 6.9 (sanitiser)	ARI and GI	N/A	NR	
Simmerman ²⁷ (Thailand, 2011)	C-RCT	HH	16	A and Ch (NR)	442 Ch; 1147 household members	✓		✓	3 weeks	4.7	Influenza	N/A	7.71 mL	54 mL/person/week = 7.71 mL/person/day
Stiebbins ²⁸ (USA, 2011)	C-RCT	Sch	14	Ch (NR)	3360 Ch; 10 Sch	✓	✓	✓	1 influenza season	2.4	Influenza	N/A	1.44 mL	0.6 mL per use × 2.4 times per day = 1.44
Zomer ²⁹ (Netherlands, 2015)	C-RCT	CCC	7	Ch (6 months to 3.5 years)	545 Ch; 71 CCC	✓		✓	6 months	NR	ARI and GI	NR	NR	

*Only hand hygiene arms of the included studies.

†This study was not included in the dose-response analysis as the infection was reported for any infection (not specific to respiratory infections).

‡Studies not included in the meta-analysis.

§Bathrooms at the workplaces were equipped with liquid hand soap (all arms).

A, adults; ARI, acute respiratory infections; avg, average; CCC, childcare centres; Ch, children; C-RCT, cluster randomised controlled trial; GI, gastrointestinal infections; HH, households; ILI, influenza-like illness; N/A, not applicable; NC, not clear; NR, not reported; O, offices; Onl, online; RCT, randomised controlled trial; Sch, schools.

number of events (eg, ARI events) in each group irrespective of the number per person. We contacted investigators to provide missing data where feasible. We used the I^2 statistic to measure heterogeneity among the included trials. We referred to the Cochrane Handbook in the interpretation of the I^2 statistic and were guided by the following ranges: 0%–40%: may represent non-significant heterogeneity; 30%–60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50%–90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity; 75%–100%: considerable heterogeneity.¹¹ Data were sufficient to conduct a subgroup analysis by comparison (soap vs sanitiser vs combination soap and sanitiser). To ensure we accounted for the clustering effect in the cluster RCTs, we extracted the appropriate

cluster-adjusted estimates from the trial reports and used the generic inverse variance method of meta-analysis.

Patient and public involvement

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

RESULTS

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow chart (figure 1) shows the number of trials identified from the 2020 parent systematic review⁵ and other sources. Eighteen trials were assessed as eligible;




Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart. PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses.




Figure 2 Overall risk of bias – presented as percentages across all included RCTs. RCTs, randomised controlled trials.

four were head-to-head comparisons of hand sanitiser and soap and water^{12–15} and 16 compared hand hygiene with a control.^{12 14 16–29} Table 1 presents study and intervention characteristics. Online supplemental file 2 contains a summary of the comparator conditions. The majority of trials used existing handwashing practices as the comparator condition. One trial additionally provided education on hand hygiene, and four provided health promotion education and provided participants with education on the prevention and treatment of respiratory tract infections. None of the studies provided control group participants with any hand hygiene materials.

Risk of bias assessment

Most studies (95%) were unblinded due to the nature of the intervention, leading to a high risk of bias judgement (figure 2). See online supplemental file 3 for risk of bias assessment for each individual trial. Only one study was blinded to staff.²⁷ Blinding of outcome assessment and attrition bias was poor across 67% and 44% of studies, respectively. Sequence generation and allocation concealment had a low risk of bias

assessment in about half of the studies. Fifty per cent of studies had unclear risk of bias for selective outcome reporting due to the lack of sufficient information.

Trials of hand sanitiser or soap and water versus control

Figure 3A presents the meta-analysis of all trials, regardless of whether the number of handwashes could be estimated. Combining the five trials of soap and water hand hygiene versus control found a non-significant increase in ARI events: RR: 1.03 (95% CI 0.86 to 1.23) but with high heterogeneity. The nine trials of hand sanitiser versus control found a significant reduction in ARI events: RR: 0.85 (95% CI 0.77 to 0.94), providing some indirect evidence in favour of hand sanitiser.

A similar pattern of results was found when only trials for which the number of handwashes could be estimated were considered (figure 3B), combining the three trials of soap and water hand hygiene versus control found a non-significant increase in ARI events: RR: 1.23 (95% CI




Figure 3 (A) Meta-analysis of all studies (regardless of whether the number of handwashes could be estimated) regardless of the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap). (B) Meta-analysis of studies whose number of handwashes could be estimated, subgrouped by the type of handwash material (soap vs sanitiser vs combination of sanitiser and soap).




Figure 4 Hand hygiene frequency ('dose') versus risk of respiratory infection (ARI, ILI or influenza). ARI, acute respiratory infection; ILI, influenza-like illness.

0.78 to 1.93) but with high heterogeneity (figure 3B). Combining the seven trials of hand sanitiser versus control found a significant reduction in ARI events: RR: 0.80 (95% CI 0.71 to 0.89).

Dose-response relationship: hand hygiene frequency versus risk of respiratory infection (ARI, ILI or influenza)

Eleven of the trials provided sufficient information to estimate the dose of hand hygiene, which we converted to number of hand hygiene events per day. Plotted against the relative risk of ARIs, there is little dose-response relationship evident for hand sanitiser (figure 4). The difference in effectiveness between hand sanitiser and soap and water does not appear to be explained by a difference in frequency. The cluster randomised trial by Little and colleagues²² primarily used soap and water but also offered participants free hand sanitiser; only 18% reported collecting the sanitiser.

Head-to-head trials of hand hygiene with hand sanitiser versus with soap and water

Four trials directly compared hand sanitiser with soap and water: two in childcare centres, one at a primary school and one in workplaces. In a cluster randomised trial of children and staff in Swedish childcare centres, those at centres who were randomised to use an alcohol-based oily disinfectant gel (70% ethanol) after regular hand washing had a reduction in absenteeism rate of 12% (95% CI 4% to 20%) compared with control centres which used only soap and water.¹³ The three-arm cluster randomised trial of 24 childcare centres in Spain: educational and hand hygiene measures (one with soap and water; another with hand sanitiser) and a control group found children in the sanitiser group had a 13% lower (95% CI 6% to 28%) risk of respiratory infection than children in the soap and water group.¹²

In Kenya, a cluster randomised trial assigned two primary schools to receive a handwashing with soap and

water intervention, two to receive a sanitiser intervention and two were a control.¹⁴ Compared with control group students, both intervention groups had a reduction in observed rhinorrhoea (RR 0.77, 95% CI 0.62 to 0.95 for both sanitiser vs control and soap vs control). No significant differences between the sanitiser and soap groups were observed for respiratory outcomes. The three-arm trial in six companies in Finland randomised workplaces to equip workplace bathrooms with liquid hand soap (soap and control arms) or alcohol-based hand rub.¹⁵ Participants in the intervention arms also received guidance on additional strategies for limiting infection transmission. Before the onset of the 2009 influenza pandemic (and the subsequent national hand hygiene campaign), a statistically significant ($p=0.002$) difference in the infection episodes was observed between the control (6.0 per year) and the soap-and-water arm (5.0 per year) but not between the control and the alcohol rub arm (5.6 per year). Neither intervention had an effect on work absenteeism.

DISCUSSION

Based on both indirect and direct (head to head) trials, hand hygiene using alcohol-based hand sanitiser appears more effective at reducing ARI transmission than hand hygiene using soap and water, with the difference in effect not explained by the difference in frequency of hand hygiene. This is an important finding, as most guidelines consider the two hand hygiene processes as equivalent, based on microbiological data for correctly performed processes.

The apparent greater effectiveness of hand sanitiser may be explained by its greater convenience, the lesser time required to perform hand hygiene, more sustained compliance with hand hygiene and less irritation to the skin.³⁰ From our review of current research, we cannot determine the relative contribution of these behavioural elements, and hence further research is warranted to examine those contributions and ways to improve each.

Limitations of this review are that conclusions are mostly from indirectness evidence, with direct evidence available from only four head-to-head trials and that it was not possible to estimate the dose of hand hygiene for some trials. The variable duration of the interventions (which ranged from 2 to 26 months) in the included studies may have impacted the reported intervention adherence and hence the comparability of it.

A recent Cochrane review of the effect of rinse-free handwashing, compared with traditional hand hygiene, on absenteeism for ARI in preschool and school children reported a significant reduction in absenteeism of 9 days per 1000 available days for children in the rinse-free group, with the results coming from six randomised trials.⁹ The effectiveness of handwashing with materials other than sanitiser or soap and water, such as ash, which may be used in low-income countries, has mostly been examined in observational studies with uncertain effects.³¹

Although the current evidence modestly favours hand sanitiser, further trials of hand hygiene methods are warranted. Any such trials should include a set of process measures looking at the 'intervention fidelity' elements, such as frequency and correctness of hand hygiene processes. Meanwhile, policy documents and public guidance should continue to suggest both but indicate that current evidence somewhat favours sanitiser for behavioural rather than biological reasons and that it should be recommended where feasible.

CONCLUSIONS

Hand hygiene has a modest but important role in reducing the transmission of ARIs. Adequately performed hand hygiene, with either soap or sanitiser, reduces the risk of acute respiratory virus transmission. However, from both the direct and indirect comparisons in this review, sanitiser appears more effective in practice. While further head-to-head randomised trials are warranted, the current evidence appears sufficient to promote the use of hand sanitiser as the primary means for many everyday situations.

Twitter Tammy Hoffmann @Tammy_Hoffmann and Mina Bakhit @Mina_Bakhit

Acknowledgements We would like to acknowledge the authors of the 2020 Cochrane review update (L AlAnsary, G Bawazeer, E Beller, J Clark, J Conly, E Dooley, E Ferroni, T Jefferson, S Thorning, M van Driel and M Jones).

Contributors TH, PG and CDM conceived the study. MB and NK screened studies for inclusion in this review and extracted the data. TH, AMS, PG and CDM analysed the data. TH wrote the first draft. All authors approved and revised the final manuscript.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplemental information.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

ORCID iDs

Tammy Hoffmann <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5210-8548>

Mina Bakhit <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6162-3362>

Natalia Krzyzaniak <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5668-7292>

Chris Del Mar <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3821-8163>

Anna Mae Scott <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0109-9001>

Paul Glasziou <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7564-073X>

REFERENCES

- 1 Ferkol T, Schraufnagel D. The global burden of respiratory disease. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2014;11:404–6.
- 2 World Health Organization. WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard, 2021. Available: [https://covid19.who.int/?gclid=EAlaQobChMI8Y7YwLqS7AIVmraWCh0sngONEAAYASAAEgKucPD_BwE; \[Accessed 01 Apr 2021\]](https://covid19.who.int/?gclid=EAlaQobChMI8Y7YwLqS7AIVmraWCh0sngONEAAYASAAEgKucPD_BwE; [Accessed 01 Apr 2021]).
- 3 Wong VWY, Cowling BJ, Aiello AE. Hand hygiene and risk of influenza virus infections in the community: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiol Infect* 2014;142:922–32.
- 4 Carcione D, Giele CM, Goggin LS, et al. Secondary attack rate of pandemic influenza A(H1N1)2009 in Western Australian households, 29 May–7 August 2009. *Eurosurveillance* 2011;16:pp. 19765.
- 5 Jefferson Tet al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. *Cochrane Database of Syst Rev* 2020;11.
- 6 Jefferson T, Del Mar CB, Dooley L, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;141.
- 7 Clark JM, Sanders S, Carter M, et al. Improving the translation of search strategies using the polyglot search translator: a randomized controlled trial. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2020;108:195–207.
- 8 Marshall IJ et al. Machine learning for identifying randomized controlled trials: an evaluation and practitioner's guide. *Res Synth Methods* 2018;9:602–14. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1287
- 9 Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Lockwood C, et al. Rinse-free hand wash for reducing absenteeism among preschool and school children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;4:CD012566. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012566.pub2
- 10 Koehler A, Wildbolz C. Comparing the environmental footprints of home-care and personal-hygiene products: the relevance of different life-cycle phases. *Environ Sci Technol* 2009;43:8643–51.
- 11 Higgins JPT et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.0. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2019 www.training.cochrane.org/handbook;
- 12 Azor-Martinez E, Yui-Hifume R, Muñoz-Vico FJ, et al. Effectiveness of a hand hygiene program at child care centers: a cluster randomized trial. *Pediatrics* 2018;142. doi:10.1542/peds.2018-1245. [Epub ahead of print: 08 10 2018].
- 13 Lennell A, Kühlmann-Berenzon S, Geli P, et al. Alcohol-based hand-disinfection reduced children's absence from Swedish day care centers. *Acta Paediatr* 2008;97:1672–80.
- 14 Pickering AJ, Davis J, Blum AG, et al. Access to waterless hand sanitizer improves student hand hygiene behavior in primary schools in Nairobi, Kenya. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2013;89:411–8.
- 15 Savolainen-Kopra C, Haapakoski J, Peltola PA, et al. Hand washing with soap and water together with behavioural recommendations prevents infections in common work environment: an open cluster-randomized trial. *Trials* 2012;13:10.
- 16 Biswas D, Ahmed M, Roguski K, et al. Effectiveness of a behavior change intervention with hand sanitizer use and respiratory hygiene in reducing laboratory-confirmed influenza among schoolchildren in Bangladesh: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2019;101:1446–55.
- 17 Correa JC, Pinto D, Salas LA, et al. A cluster-randomized controlled trial of hand rubs for prevention of infectious diseases among children in Colombia. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 2012;31:476–84.
- 18 Cowling BJ, Chan K-H, Fang VJ, et al. Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:437–46.
- 19 Cowling BJ, Fung ROP, Cheng CKY, et al. Preliminary findings of a randomized trial of non-pharmaceutical interventions to prevent influenza transmission in households. *PLoS One* 2008;3:e2101.
- 20 Hübner N-O, Hübner C, Wodny M, et al. Effectiveness of alcohol-based hand disinfectants in a public administration: impact on health and work performance related to acute respiratory symptoms and diarrhoea. *BMC Infect Dis* 2010;10:250.
- 21 Larson EL, Ferng Y-hui, Wong-McLoughlin J, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on URIs and influenza in crowded, urban households. *Public Health Rep* 2010;125:178–91.
- 22 Little P, Stuart B, Hobbs FDR, et al. An internet-delivered handwashing intervention to modify influenza-like illness and respiratory infection transmission (PRIMIT): a primary care randomised trial. *Lancet* 2015;386:1631–9.
- 23 Nicholson JA, Naeeni M, Hoptroff M, et al. An investigation of the effects of a hand washing intervention on health outcomes and school absence using a randomised trial in Indian urban communities. *Trop Med Int Health* 2014;19:284–92.
- 24 Ram PK, DiVita MA, Khatun-e-Jannat K, et al. Impact of intensive handwashing promotion on secondary household influenza-like illness in rural Bangladesh: findings from a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2015;10:p. e0125200.

- 25 Roberts L, PhD Epid., Smith W, Jorm L, *et al.* Effect of infection control measures on the frequency of upper respiratory infection in child care: a randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics* 2000;105:738–42.
- 26 Sandora TJ, Taveras EM, Shih M-C, *et al.* A randomized, controlled trial of a multifaceted intervention including alcohol-based hand sanitizer and hand-hygiene education to reduce illness transmission in the home. *Pediatrics* 2005;116:587–94.
- 27 Simmerman JM, Suntarattiwong P, Levy J, *et al.* Findings from a household randomized controlled trial of hand washing and face masks to reduce influenza transmission in Bangkok, Thailand. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2011;5:256–67.
- 28 Stebbins S, Cummings DAT, Stark JH, *et al.* Reduction in the incidence of influenza A but not influenza B associated with use of hand sanitizer and cough hygiene in schools: a randomized controlled trial. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2011;30:921–6.
- 29 Zomer TP, Erasmus V, Looman CW, *et al.* A hand hygiene intervention to reduce infections in child daycare: a randomized controlled trial. *Epidemiol Infect* 2015;143:2494–502.
- 30 Pittet D. Improving adherence to hand hygiene practice: a multidisciplinary approach. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2001;7:234–40.
- 31 Paludan-Müller AS, Boesen K, Klerings I, *et al.* Hand cleaning with ash for reducing the spread of viral and bacterial infections: a rapid review. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;4:CD013597.

Online supplementary file 1: Search strings for databases**PubMed search string**

("Influenza, Human"[Mesh] OR "Influenzavirus A"[Mesh] OR "Influenzavirus B"[Mesh] OR
 "Influenzavirus C"[Mesh] OR Influenza[tiab] OR "Respiratory Tract Diseases"[Mesh] OR "Bacterial
 Infections/transmission"[Mesh] OR Influenzas[tiab] OR "Influenza-like"[tiab] OR ILI[tiab] OR Flu[tiab]
 OR Flus[tiab] OR "Common Cold"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "common cold"[tiab] OR colds[tiab] OR
 coryza[tiab] OR coronavirus[Mesh] OR "sars virus"[Mesh] OR coronavirus[tiab] OR
 Coronaviruses[tiab] OR "coronavirus infections"[Mesh] OR "severe acute respiratory
 syndrome"[Mesh] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome"[tiab] OR "severe acute respiratory
 syndromes"[tiab] OR sars[tiab] OR "respiratory syncytial viruses"[Mesh] OR "respiratory syncytial
 virus, human"[Mesh] OR "Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infections"[Mesh] OR "respiratory syncytial
 virus"[tiab] OR "respiratory syncytial viruses"[tiab] OR rsv[tiab] OR parainfluenza[tiab] OR
 "Respiratory illness"[tiab] OR ((Transmission[tiab]) AND (Coughing[tiab] OR Sneezing[tiab])) OR
 ((respiratory[tiab] AND Tract[tiab]) AND (infection[tiab] OR Infections[tiab] OR illness[tiab]))
 AND
 ("Hand Hygiene"[Mesh] OR handwashing[tiab] OR hand-washing[tiab] OR ((Hand[tiab] OR
 Alcohol[tiab]) AND (wash[tiab] OR Washing[tiab] OR Cleansing[tiab] OR Rinses[tiab] OR hygiene[tiab]
 OR rub[tiab] OR Rubbing[tiab] OR sanitizer[tiab] OR sanitiser[tiab] OR cleanser[tiab] OR
 disinfected[tiab] OR Disinfectant[tiab] OR Disinfect[tiab] OR antiseptic[tiab] OR virucid[tiab])) OR
 "gloves, protective"[Mesh] OR Glove[tiab] OR Gloves[tiab] OR Masks[Mesh] OR "respiratory
 protective devices"[Mesh] OR facemask[tiab] OR Facemasks[tiab] OR mask[tiab] OR Masks[tiab] OR
 respirator[tiab] OR respirators[tiab] OR "Protective Clothing"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Protective
 Devices"[Mesh] OR "patient isolation"[tiab] OR ((school[tiab] OR Schools[tiab]) AND (Closure[tiab]
 OR Closures[tiab] OR Closed[tiab])) OR Quarantine[Mesh] OR quarantine[tiab] OR "Hygiene
 intervention"[tiab] OR "Mouthwashes"[Mesh] OR gargling[tiab] OR "nasal tissues"[tiab] OR "Eye
 Protective Devices"[Mesh] OR Glasses[tiab] OR Goggle[tiab] OR "Eye protection"[tiab] OR
 Faceshield[tiab] OR Faceshields[tiab] OR Goggles[tiab] OR "Face shield"[tiab] OR "Face shields"[tiab]
 OR Visors[tiab])
 AND
 ("Communicable Disease Control"[Mesh] OR "Disease Outbreaks"[Mesh] OR "Disease Transmission,
 Infectious"[Mesh] OR "Infection Control"[Mesh] OR Transmission[sh] OR "Prevention and
 control"[sh] OR "Communicable Disease Control"[tiab] OR "Secondary transmission"[tiab] OR
 ((Reduced[tiab] OR Reduce[tiab] OR Reduction[tiab] OR Reducing[tiab] OR Lower[tiab]) AND
 (Incidence[tiab] OR Occurrence[tiab] OR Transmission[tiab] OR Secondary[tiab]))
 AND
 (Randomized controlled trial[pt] OR controlled clinical trial[pt] OR randomized[tiab] OR
 randomised[tiab] OR placebo[tiab] OR "drug therapy"[sh] OR randomly[tiab] OR trial[tiab] OR
 groups[tiab])
 NOT
 (Animals[Mesh] not (Animals[Mesh] and Humans[Mesh]))
 NOT
 ("Case Reports"[pt] OR Editorial[pt] OR Letter[pt] OR Meta-Analysis[pt] OR "Observational
 Study"[pt] OR "Systematic Review"[pt] OR "Case Report"[ti] OR "Case series"[ti] OR Meta-
 Analysis[ti] OR "Meta Analysis"[ti] OR "Systematic Review"[ti])

Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) search string

([mh "Influenza, Human"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus A"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus B"] OR [mh "Influenzavirus C"] OR Influenza:ti,ab OR [mh "Respiratory Tract Diseases"] OR Influenzas:ti,ab OR "Influenza-like":ti,ab OR ILI:ti,ab OR Flu:ti,ab OR Flus:ti,ab OR [mh ^"Common Cold"] OR "common cold":ti,ab OR colds:ti,ab OR coryza:ti,ab OR [mh coronavirus] OR [mh "sars virus"] OR coronavirus:ti,ab OR Coronaviruses:ti,ab OR [mh "coronavirus infections"] OR [mh "severe acute respiratory syndrome"] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome":ti,ab OR "severe acute respiratory syndromes":ti,ab OR sars:ti,ab OR [mh "respiratory syncytial viruses"] OR [mh "respiratory syncytial virus, human"] OR [mh "Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infections"] OR "respiratory syncytial virus":ti,ab OR "respiratory syncytial viruses":ti,ab OR rsv:ti,ab OR parainfluenza:ti,ab OR "Respiratory illness":ti,ab OR ((Transmission) AND (Coughing OR Sneezing)) OR ((respiratory:ti,ab AND Tract) AND (infection:ti,ab OR Infections:ti,ab OR illness:ti,ab)))

AND

([mh "Hand Hygiene"] OR handwashing:ti,ab OR "hand-washing":ti,ab OR ((Hand:ti,ab OR Alcohol:ti,ab) AND (wash:ti,ab OR Washing:ti,ab OR Cleansing:ti,ab OR Rinses:ti,ab OR hygiene:ti,ab OR rub:ti,ab OR Rubbing:ti,ab OR sanitizer:ti,ab OR sanitiser:ti,ab OR cleanser:ti,ab OR disinfected:ti,ab OR Disinfectant:ti,ab OR Disinfect:ti,ab OR antiseptic:ti,ab OR virucid:ti,ab)) OR [mh "gloves, protective"] OR Glove:ti,ab OR Gloves:ti,ab OR [mh Masks] OR [mh "respiratory protective devices"] OR facemask:ti,ab OR Facemasks:ti,ab OR mask:ti,ab OR Masks:ti,ab OR respirator:ti,ab OR respirators:ti,ab OR [mh ^"Protective Clothing"] OR [mh "Protective Devices"] OR "patient isolation":ti,ab OR ((school:ti,ab OR Schools:ti,ab) AND (Closure:ti,ab OR Closures:ti,ab OR Closed:ti,ab)) OR [mh Quarantine] OR quarantine:ti,ab OR "Hygiene intervention":ti,ab OR [mh Mouthwashes] OR gargling:ti,ab OR "nasal tissues":ti,ab OR [mh "Eye Protective Devices"] OR Glasses:ti,ab OR Goggle:ti,ab OR "Eye protection":ti,ab OR Faceshield:ti,ab OR Faceshields:ti,ab OR Goggles:ti,ab OR "Face shield":ti,ab OR "Face shields":ti,ab OR Visors:ti,ab)

AND

([mh "Communicable Disease Control"] OR [mh "Disease Outbreaks"] OR [mh "Disease Transmission, Infectious"] OR [mh "Infection Control"] OR "Communicable Disease Control":ti,ab OR "Secondary transmission":ti,ab OR ((Reduced:ti,ab OR Reduce:ti,ab OR Reduction:ti,ab OR Reducing:ti,ab OR Lower:ti,ab) AND (Incidence:ti,ab OR Occurrence:ti,ab OR Transmission:ti,ab OR Secondary:ti,ab))

Adapted from: T. Jefferson *et al.*, "Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2020.

Online supplementary table 2: Summary of intervention and control for each included trial

Study	Intervention	Control
Azor-Martinez 2018	1. Soap and water + hand hygiene workshop 2. Hand sanitiser + hand hygiene workshop	Existing/usual handwashing practices and education on hand hygiene
Biswas 2019	Hand sanitiser + respiratory hygiene education	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Correa 2012	Hand sanitiser as a complement to handwashing	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Cowling 2008	1. Healthy diet and lifestyle education + face mask education + face masks 2. Healthy diet and lifestyle education + hand hygiene education plus + sanitiser and soap	Education about the importance of a healthy diet and lifestyle for illness prevention and symptom alleviation
Cowling 2009	1. Healthy diet and lifestyle education + face mask education + face masks 2. Healthy diet and lifestyle education + hand hygiene education + hand sanitiser and soap	Education about the importance of a healthy diet and lifestyle for illness prevention and symptom alleviation
Hubner 2010	Hand sanitiser	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Larson 2010	1. Education on upper respiratory tract infection (URTI) prevention and treatment + hand-sanitiser 2. Education on URTI prevention and treatment + hand-sanitiser + face masks	Education on the prevention and treatment of URTIs and influenza
Lennell 2008	Hand sanitiser as a complement to handwashing	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Little 2015	Automated web-based educational intervention, monitored handwashing behaviour, automated emails and tailored feedback	Existing/usual handwashing practices - no access to intervention webpages
Nicholson 2014	Soap + social marketing programme	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Pickering 2013	1. Teacher hand hygiene training session + soap 2. Teacher hand hygiene training session + hand sanitiser	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Ram 2015	Soap + daily handwashing promotion	Existing/usual handwashing practices

Roberts 2000	Handwashing programme and training for staff and children	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Sandora 2005	Hand sanitiser + hand-hygiene educational materials	Education on a healthy diet and good nutrition
Savolainen-Kopra 2012	1. Hand-hygiene with soap and water + standardised instructions on limiting infection transmission 2. Hand-hygiene with hand sanitiser	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Simmerman 2011	1. Hand washing 2. Hand washing + face masks	Education on nutrition, physical activity, and smoking cessation
Stebbins 2011	Training in hand and respiratory hygiene + hand sanitiser	Existing/usual handwashing practices
Zomer 2015	Hand hygiene products (paper towel dispensers, soap, hand sanitiser, hand cream) + training sessions and materials + reminder posters/stickers	Existing/usual handwashing practices

Online supplementary file 3: Risk of bias for each item for each included trial

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)
Azor-Martinez 2018	+	+	-	-	+	?
Biswas 2019	+	+	-	-	-	?
Correa 2012	+	?	-	-	+	?
Cowling 2008	+	+	-	-	-	-
Cowling 2009	+	+	-	?	-	?
Hubner 2010	?	?	-	-	+	?
Larson 2010	?	?	-	?	-	?
Lennell 2008	+	?	-	?	?	+
Little 2015	?	+	-	-	-	+
Nicholson 2014	-	+	-	-	-	?
Pickering 2013	?	?	-	-	?	?
Ram 2015	+	+	-	-	+	+
Roberts 2000	+	?	-	+	?	+
Sandora 2005	+	+	-	-	+	?
Savolainen-Kopra 2012	?	+	-	-	-	+
Simmerman 2011	+	?	+	+	+	+
Stebbins 2011	+	+	-	+	-	?
Zomer 2015	+	?	-	-	+	+